



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1260
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,217	01/02/2002	Robert Allan Unger	SNY-R4646.01	8614
24337 7590 04/19/2007 MILLER PATENT SERVICES 2500 DOCKERY LANE RALEIGH, NC 27606			EXAMINER MOORTHY, ARAVIND K	
			ART UNIT 2131	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE 3 MONTHS			MAIL DATE 04/19/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/038,217

Applicant(s)

UNGER ET AL.

Examiner

Aravind K. Moorthy

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40, 51-135 and 139-178 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30, 62-135 and 165-176 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 31, 51, 139, 148, 150 and 152-154 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 32-40, 52-61, 140-147, 149, 151 and 155-164 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f):
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date see attachment.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the communications filed on 12 February 2007.
2. Claims 1-40, 51-135 and 139-178 are pending in the application.
3. Claims 31, 51, 139, 148, 150 and 152-154 have been rejected.
4. Claims 1-30, 62-135 and 165-176 have been allowed.
5. Claims 32-40, 52-61, 140-147, 149, 151 and 155-164 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.
4. Claims 41-50 and 136-138 have been cancelled.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The examiner has considered the information disclosure statement filed on 12 February 2007.

Response to Arguments

6. Regarding the prior art, the Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-40, 51-135 and 139-178 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
7. Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101, the examiner maintains the rejection. The Applicant's amendment does not overcome the rejection. Claims 1, 16, 31, 62, 89, 102, 148, 150, 153 and 154 are directed towards a signal with no function.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. Claims 1, 16, 31, 62, 89, 102, 148, 150, 153 and 154 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Independent claims 1, 16, 31, 62, 89, 102, 148, 150, 153 and 154 are directed towards a method of encrypting a digital television signal. When nonfunctional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, in a computer or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, it is not statutory since no requisite functionality is present to satisfy the practical application requirement. Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas, stored in a computer-readable medium, in a computer, on an electromagnetic carrier signal does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because "[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer."). Such a result would exalt form over substance. In *re Sarkar*, 588 F.2d 1330, 1333, 200 USPQ 132, 137 (CCPA 1978) ("[E]ach invention must be evaluated as claimed; yet semantogenic considerations preclude a determination based solely on words appearing in the claims. In the final analysis under Sec. 101, the claimed invention, as a whole, must be evaluated for what it is.") (quoted with approval in *Abele*, 684 F.2d at 907, 214 USPQ at 687). See also In *re Johnson*, 589 F.2d 1070, 1077, 200 USPQ 199, 206 (CCPA 1978) ("form of the claim is often an exercise in drafting").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1-30, 134 and 165 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Independent claims 1, 16 and 165 have been amended to include the limitation "distributing the multiple partially encrypted digital television signal". However, it is unclear to the examiner how a multiple partially encrypted digital signal can be distributed. If the unencrypted packets are replaced with first and second encrypted packets in the digital television signal, it is unclear how it is multiple partially encrypted. An unencrypted signal would not exist. Therefore, the whole signal would be encrypted and would not be multiple partially encrypted.

Claim 134 recites identifying packets of a packet type, encrypting packets of the packet type using a first encryption and a second encryption. Claim 134 recites replacing the packets of the packet type with the first and second encrypted packets to produce partially dual encrypted content. The examiner asserts that there is no recitation of a particular packet type that gets the first encryption and there is no particular packet type that gets the second encryption. It is unclear to the examiner how a packet with first and second encrypted packets can be partially encrypted. If everything is encrypted, how can it be partially encrypted?

Double Patenting

10. Claims 31 and 152-154 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,124,303. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Therefore, Claims 31 and 152-154 of the instant application are anticipated by claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,124,303 because all the limitation of broader genus claims of the instant application are contained in the narrower species claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,124,303, as enunciated in *ELI LILLY AND COMPANY v BARR LABORATORIES, INC.*, United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, ON PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC (DECIDED: May 30, 2001).

“A later patent claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim if the later claim is obvious over, or **anticipated by**, the earlier claim. In re Longi, 759 F.2d at 896, 225 USPQ at 651 (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting because the claims at issue were obvious over claims in four prior art patents); In re Berg, 140 F.3d at 1437, 46 USPQ2d at 1233 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting where a patent application claim to a genus is anticipated by a patent claim to a species within that genus). “*ELI LILLY AND COMPANY v BARR LABORATORIES, INC.*, United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, ON PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC (DECIDED: May 30, 2001).

11. Claims 51, 139, 148, 150 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,155,012. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Art Unit: 2131

Therefore, Claims 51, 139, 148, 150 of the instant application are anticipated by claim 22 of U.S. Patent No. 7,155,012 because all the limitation of broader genus claims of the instant application are contained in the narrower species claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,155,012, as enunciated in *ELI LILLY AND COMPANY v BARR LABORATORIES, INC.*, United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, ON PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC (DECIDED: May 30, 2001).

“A later patent claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim if the later claim is obvious over, or **anticipated by**, the earlier claim. *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d at 896, 225 USPQ at 651 (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting because the claims at issue were obvious over claims in four prior art patents); *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d at 1437, 46 USPQ2d at 1233 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting where a patent application claim to a genus is anticipated by a patent claim to a species within that genus). “*ELI LILLY AND COMPANY v BARR LABORATORIES, INC.*, United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, ON PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC (DECIDED: May 30, 2001).

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claims 1-30, 62-135 and 165-176 are allowed.

Prior art does not disclose or fairly teach replacing the unencrypted packets of the packet type with the first and second encrypted packets in the digital television signal to produce a multiple partially encrypted digital television signal.

Prior art does not disclose or fairly teach that the encrypted packets comprise at least a first encrypted packet encrypted under first encryption method and a second encrypted packet

Art Unit: 2131

encrypted under a second encryption method, and a remainder of the packets are unencrypted, wherein the encrypted packets contain information that is required for correct decoding of the television signal.

Any claims not directly addressed are allowed on the virtue of their dependency.

13. Claims 32-40, 51-61, 140-147, 149, 151 and 155-164 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aravind K. Moorthy whose telephone number is 571-272-3793. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2131

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Aravind K Moorthy *AM*
April 16, 2007

Ayaz Sheikh
AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100